ERIC Document Resume	See Instruction Sheet	DATE OF RESUME 8/18/65	DATE RECEIVED

A. PUBLICATION DATA

1. ERIC NUMBER	2. ORIGINATOR CONTROL NO(S).	3. IDENTIFICATION NO.	DO NOT WRITE IN SPACE BELOW
ED000586	7337		

4. AUTHOR(S): Wildman, W. W.

5. TITLE OF DOCUMENT ABSTRACTED: Methods of Identifying Excellence in College Teaching

6. PUBLICATION TITLE: N.A.

7. EDITOR(S): N.A.

8. PLACE OF ORIGIN
ORG.
ST.
CITY, STATE
TELE. EXT.
INST/LOC CODE

9. PUBLISHER OR SOURCE: U.S. Air Force Academy

10. VOL.	11. PAGES	12. MO./YR.	13. TOTAL PP.
N.A.	N.A.	Since 57	

MICROFILM COPY AVAILABLE YES [R] NO [ ]

COPYRIGHT GRANTED YES [ ] NO [R]

COPYRIGHT RELEASE FILED YES [ ] NO [ ]

TYPE OF REPORT
PROPOSAL [ ]
IN-PROGRESS [ ]
FINAL [R]
FOLLOW-UP [ ]

OTHER ERIC REFERENCES:

ERIC SATELLITE CODE

B. INDEXING DATA

14. SUBJECT AREA

15. TYPE OF ENDEAVOR: survey

16. INDEXING TERMS (8-12)

	effectiveness	faculty		
surveys	measurement			
teaching methods	teachers			

17. ABSTRACT (MAX. 200 WORDS)

Reviews literature on evaluation of teaching and presents results of questionnaire study to determine relative importance of methods in State universities for identifying excellence in teaching. Conclusions were that: Methods to identify excellence in college teaching vary widely within and between universities; the most controversial method was the use of student questionnaires or ratings; most universities recognize and consider all types of performance expected of a teacher; pre- and post-course tests are used least and ranked lowest; and except for the use of student ratings, there was a high correlation among the ratings of the relative importance of the various methods by the various universities.

RIC No.

18. SOURCE OF ABSTRACT

C. FUNDING DATA

19. SUPPORTING ORGANIZATION	20. DIVISION OR DEPT.	21. CONTRACT NO. / PROJECT NO.
	22. TOTAL COST OF PROJECT	
	23. DURATION OR PROJECT	U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Office of Education

RIC Form 1

IV-23 ED000586 Reporter 4 7-337 1/28

by WILDMAN, W. W.
Bd 0 3822

U.S. Air Force Academy. IV- 23

"METHODS OF IDENTIFYING EXCELLENCE IN COLLEGE TEACHING,"

Eckert (1) wrote in 1950 that the search at that time for means of appraising college teaching was a highly encouraging sign, for it showed that we were thinking more realistically about our educational problems. Recognizing that the strength of any college depends basically on the competence and devotion of its faculty, educators are seeking to identify - and ultimately to measure - those characteristics that help to make an institution great.

Faculty members perform many kinds of services, all of which need to be considered in appraising their contributions to campus life. The importance of duties other than teaching, such as administrative work, creative research, student counseling, and communitive service, should not be minimized. Yet it is evident that little emphasis has been placed upon quality of performance in the classroom. The two standards with which the college teacher early becomes acquainted are scholarship and research.

A report issued in 1933 by the Committee on College and University Teaching of the American Association of University Professors advocated that teaching ability be ranked first among the factors considered in evaluating faculty services. But it points out that college teaching is far more difficult to judge than productive scholarship since the real test of its quality lies not in the particular methods the teacher uses but in the effect of these procedures upon students.

7337

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

President Logan Wilson wrote in 1941 "it is a curious paradox that academicians display a scientific attitude toward every universe of inquiry except that which comprises their own profession - - Lacking precise qualitative criteria (for the measurement of faculty excellence) administrators are prone to fall back upon rather crude quantitative measures as a partial substitute."

In consequence, "teaching ability" has too often been judged on the basis of the number of students registered for a course, the percentage who elect more advanced work in the field, hearsay reports from occasional students, or casual observation of one or two classes by a department head or dean.

Eckert (1) listed a number of ways of evaluating college teaching. These methods were used as a basis of a questionnaire that was sent to the presidents of fifty state universities in 46 states in order to determine what methods are actually being utilized to identify excellence in college teaching and the relative importance of each. The following is a copy of the questionnaire that was utilized (the short titles - s.t. - were not on the original questionnaire but will be used for reference to these items throughout the remainder of this paper to conserve space): (See page 3)

Questionnaire

Methods of Identifying Excellence in College Teaching

The purpose of this study is to determine the relative importance of the methods being employed in identifying excellence in college teaching.

Please indicate the relative importance at your university of the following methods of identifying excellence in teaching by indicating their numerical order. A rating of 1 would indicate the most important method; a rating of 2 would indicate the second most important method, etc. Leave blank those methods that are not utilized at your university. Additional methods and their relative importance may be listed under item 12.

Rating

___1. Evaluation of teachers by means of student questionnaires or ratings. (s.t.* - Student ratings)

___2. Unsolicited testimony of students in interviews with advisors and counselors. (Unsolicited testimony of students)

___3. Observation and comments by colleagues. (Observation by colleagues)

___4. Observation by administrators.

___5. Inspection of course materials developed by the teacher for his courses. (Course materials developed.)

___6. Comparison of the standings of students in departmental exams with the standings of students of other instructors. (Students' departmental exam standings)

___7. Comparison of pre-course and post-course tests. (Pre- and post-course tests).

___8. Work published or delivered before learned societies. (Work published).

___9. Contributions to methods and materials of instruction. (Contributions to methods).

___10. Observation of part taken in college discussions and committee work focused on teaching problems. (Committee work).

___11. Study of activity of students while taking course (library work).

___12. Other methods. _____

The name of your college of university: _____

*short title

Questionnaires were sent to the presidents of the following state universities:

1. #Un. of Alabama
2. Un. of Arizona
3. *Un. of Arkansas
4. Un. of California
5. #Un. of Colorado
6. #Colorado State Un.
7. Un. of Connecticut
8. #Un. of Delaware
9. #Un. of Florida
10. #Florida State Un.
11. *Un. of Georgia
12. *Un. of Illinois
13. Indiana Un.
14. State Un. of Iowa
15. xUn. of Kansas
16. #Un. of Kentucky
17. #Louisiana State Un.
18. Un. of Maine
19. Un. of Maryland
20. #Un. of Massachusetts
21. Michigan State Un.
22. #Un. of Michigan
23. *Un. of Minnesota
24. #Un. of Mississippi
25. #Un. of Missouri
26. #Montana State Un.
27. Un. of Nebraska
28. #Un. of Nevada
29. Un. of New Hampshire
30. Un. of New Mexico
31. #New York Un.
32. #Un. of North Carolina
33. Un of North Dakota
34. Ohio Un.
35. #Ohio State Un.
36. Un. of Oklahoma
37. #Un. of Oregon
38. Un. of Pennsylvania
39. Pennsylvania State Un.
40. #Un. of Rhode Island
41. Un. of South Carolina
42. #Un. of South Dakota
43. #Un. of Tennessee
44. xUn. of Utah
45. Un. of Vermont
46. xUn. of Virginia
47. Un. of Washington
48. West Virginia Un.
49. Un. of Wisconsin
50. Un. of Wyoming

Completed and returned the questionnaire.
* Did not complete the questionnaire but furnished comments.
x Returned the questionnaire unanswered.

The questionnaires were completed by university presidents, deans, assistants to the dean, assistants to the vice president, and a director of a university bureau of institutional research.

Six questionnaires were returned unanswered because the methods used within the colleges and departments of the university varied so widely that the administrative officer concerned felt that he could not indicate a rating which would be truly representative of his university.

Twenty-one questionnaires were completed and returned. The following chart indicates the summation of the results of the questionnaire:

The methods are listed in the order of the average rating of importance as indicated by the answers to the questionnaires. The percentage figure indicates the percentage of the universities replying that use the method listed.

Average Rating	Percentage Utilizing	Method of Identifying Teaching Excellence
1.	100%	Study of teaching by colleagues.
2.	90%	Observation by administrators.
3.	100%	Work published.
4.	95%	Unsolicited testimony of students.
5.	90%	Committee work.
6.	86%	Contributions to methods of instruction.
7.	76%	Course materials developed.
8.	57%	Students' departmental exam standings.
9.	33%	Activity of students.
10.	57%	Student ratings.
11.	29%	Pre- and post-course tests.

Under item 12 of the questionnaire (Other methods) the following methods were listed:

1. "An appraisal over a period of time of the teacher's ability as a teacher, made by students, former students, colleagues and deans."

2. "Devotion to the teaching task as evidenced by sacrifices in time and energy in behalf of students."

3. "Teacher self-evaluation."

The following comments were made in letters returned with the questionnaires:

1. "I think that it is very doubtful that student question-

,naires can be very useful in rating teaching excellence. It may be more a measure of teacher popularity. The use of this device by administrators would very likely generate faculty hostility."

Undoubtedly, excellent teachers are aided in the quality of their teaching by research, publications, and the attendance of meetings of learned societies but there is very little reason to suppose that all who are able in the field of research and publication are therefore excellent teachers."

2. "Because our University has no standard methods of evaluating teaching effectiveness, it is not possible to rank order the methods listed. The different colleges have their own methods of identifying excellence in teaching - some systematic, some not. The method used most generally is probably student ratings."

Eckert (1) stated that student ratings are the most controversial way of evaluating college teaching. The two extremes of opinion indicated in the comments above and the wide variance of the ratings themselves indicate that this is true. Although student ratings were used by only 57% of the universities replying and its average rating was tenth out of eleven, two state universities (among the first seven largest universities in the country) rated it as number one or the most important method.

Morsh (5) of the Personnel Research Laboratory, Air Force Personnel and Training Research Center showed by controlled tests and surveys in Air Force schools that students' ratings of instructor's teaching effectiveness and supervisors' rating of instructors' verbal facility are correlated significantly

with student gains.

Eckert (1) said that persons opposed to student ratings say students are too immature to make such judgements and are consequently swayed by superficial features of teaching process. Studies show ratings by experienced persons are remarkably similar. Although students seldom have a clear concept of what good teaching is and are often unable to analyse teaching ability, they do not need to be able to do such things in answering simple questions about their reactions, which is all any of the current rating scales require. Since students are the "consumers", they should be permitted to have some say in the evaluation of their teachers. The most valid criticism of student ratings is that teachers may be influenced to seek popularity at the expense of their function in stimulating sound learning (See comment #1, page 6).

Although pre- and post-course tests were only utilised by 29% of the universities replying and its average rank of relative importance was eleventh or last, Morsh (5) said that student growth or gains is one of the most, if not the most important criterion of instructor effectiveness. It is sometimes a difficult criteria to measure because of the controls required to make comparisons meaningful. He found that subject matter achievement can be reliably measured and that student gains correlated signifantly with students' ratings of instructor's teaching effectiveness and supervisors' rating of instructors' verbal facility.

Hutchisson (4) felt that we should be attempting to measure the learning rate and to use it not so much as a measure of the

student's performance but as that of the teacher's.

Observation by administrators was utilized by 90% of the state universities replying and its average rank of relative importance was second out of eleven. This method, however, may not correctly identify excellence in teaching nor may it be preferred by the teachers themselves for this reason. In reply to the question "Do you believe that administrative officers have adequate information concerning teacher efficiency?" only 14% of the teachers said "yes" (3).(Un. of Wash. questionnaire)

Groshong (2) wrote that no teacher-evaluation policy is fair which excludes consideration for any kind of performance expected of the teacher. If his job requires that he have special knowledge, then he should be recognized for distinguished contributions to that knowledge. All universities replying to the questionnaires indicated that credit is given for work published or delivered before learned societies, and the average rank of relative importance of this method was third out of eleven. Groshong points out that some institutions make publication the sole criterion of the teacher's excellence. The instructor not only must publish a minimum number of research articles to qualify for tenure, but also, having won tenure, he must add to his publications list to earn increases in rank and salary. Under the publish-or-else policy, quantity rather than quality of publication often becomes the sign of the good teacher. The administrator may, and sometimes does, find it convenient to rank his staff according to the mere frequency of publication or even according to the number of printed pages. The replies to the questionnaires did not indicate that this was so at any

of the universities reporting.

Travers (6) says college administrators have felt the need for recognizing merit of those members of the faculty whose contribution to the institution lies in effective teaching rather than in research activities.

He evaluated the most methods advocated - student growth, student ratings, and rating by observers. His conclusion was that there are no methods available for appraising the effectiveness *of teaching at the higher levels of education.*

Conclusions:

1. The methods used to identify excellence in college vary widely from university to university, from college to college within universities, and from department to department within colleges.

2. The most controversial method and the method receiving the greatest variance in ratings of importance was the use of student questionnaires or ratings.

3. The majority of the universities recognize and take into consideration all the types of performance expected of a teacher (nine out of eleven methods were utilized by more than 50% of the universities replying).

4. Perhaps the best indication of teacher effectiveness, pre- and post-course tests, is used least and was ranked lowest, probably due to the difficulty in obtaining accuracy because of the many controls required.

5. Except for the use of student ratings, there was a high degree of correlation among the ratings of relative importance of the various methods by the various universities.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Eckert, Ruth E. "Ways of Evaluating College Teaching," School and Society, 71:65-69, February 1950.

2. Groshong, J. W. "Teacher or Scholar: Whom to Reward?" Improving College and University Teaching, 4:56-58, Summer 1956.

3. Guthrie, E. R. "The Evaluation of Teaching," The Educational Record, 30:109-115.

4. Hutchisson, Elmer. "Measuring Teaching Performance," Improving College and University Teaching, 5:42-45, Spring 1957.

5. Marsh, J. E., Burgess, G. G., and Smith, P. N. "Student Achievement as a Measure of Instructor Effectiveness," The Journal of Educational Psychology, 47:79-88, February 1956.

6. Travers, R. M. W. "Appraisal of the Teaching of the College Faculty," Journal of Higher Education, 21:41-42, January 1950.

7. Wilson, Logan. American Association of University Professors Bulletin, October 1941, pages 442-449.